

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application.

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected to; Claims 1-3, 9-11, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 6,564,380); Claims 4 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of Arai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,401); Claims 5, 8, 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of Nelson (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,568); and Claims 6, 7, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy in view of Waytena et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,770).

The specification is amended as requested by the Official Action. No new matter is added.

Briefly recapitulating, original Claim 1 is directed to a content distribution notification method of informing a client user of a client terminal apparatus that a content distribution will be performed based on a reservation. The content distribution notification method includes a) sending reservation request information (including a desired service time) to use a distribution server and contact addresses of clients user who should be informed that the content distribution will be performed; and b) sending notification information for notifying that the content distribution will be performed to the contact addresses of the client users. That is, the claim is directed to a method of reserving content distribution assets on behalf of third parties, and then notifying the third parties of the time that the content will be distributed.

Murphy describes an Internet video feed system and method that includes an ability for users to request access to previously scheduled video feeds, along with an ability to grant users access to said previously scheduled video feeds.<sup>1</sup> However, contrary to the Official Action, Murphy does not disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed steps of sending reservation request information for third parties and then notifying the third party the content distribution will be performed.

Applicants have also considered Arai, Nelson and Waytena and submit these references do not cure the deficiencies of Murphy. As none of the cited prior art, individually or in combination, disclose or suggest all the elements of independent Claims 1, 9, and 17, Applicants submit the inventions defined by Claims 1, 9, and 17, and all claims depending therefrom, are not rendered obvious by the asserted references for at least the reasons stated above.<sup>2</sup>

Accordingly, in view of the present amendment and in light of the previous discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request an early and favorable action to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

Michael E. Monaco  
Registration No. 52,041

I:\ATTY\MM\AMENDMENT\6541\212768US.AM DUE 3-8-05.DOC

<sup>1</sup> Murphy, abstract; column 3, lines 25-53; column 7, lines 30-45.

<sup>2</sup> MPEP § 2142 "...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)."